

## **SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW**

### **Attendees, Date and Type of Interview**

The telephonic interview was conducted on November 4, 2009 and attended by the Examiner Alexander Orkin, his Supervisor Jackie Ho and the undersigned attorney.

### **Exhibits and/or Demonstrations**

Applicants presented a sample showing an embodiment of the present invention along with written materials explaining its use.

### **Identification of Claims Discussed**

Claim 1

### **Identification of Prior Art Discussed**

Prior art cited in the most recent Office Action

### **Proposed Amendments**

None

### **Principal Arguments and Other Matters**

Applicants explained to the Examiners that the presently claimed invention does not require a knot in order to secure a thread end, whereas all the prior art cited in the Office Action require a knot or knot-like structure. To more clearly describe this patentable feature in the Claims, Applicants proposed amending independent claims to incorporate the recitation "without tying a knot at the anterior loop". Upon this proposal, the Examiner Ho questioned the support for such an amendment and Applicants provided Figure 4 and the related description in the originally filed specification. The Examiners agreed that the foregoing provided adequate support for Applicants' proposed amendment and suggested to incorporate the recitation at the end of Claim 1. Applicants also presented a sample showing at least some embodiments of the present invention to help the Examiners understand the invention.

### **Results of Interview**

Applicants explained that none of the cited prior art disclosed any mechanism for preventing unraveling without tying a knot. The Examiners agreed and concluded that the foregoing amendment and arguments would "overcome the art" currently on record, but, that they would have to conduct an updated search to determine if additional prior art would need to be cited for a teaching of preventing unraveling without tying a knot.